

REMARKS

Claims 1, 10, 29, and 41-58 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 10, 29, 44, 45, 50, 51, 56, and 57 are hereby amended. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the claims.

Rejections Based Upon 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 10, 29, 41, 43-46, 49-52, 53, and 55-58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,430,623 (Alkhatib). Applicant traverses the rejection for the following reasons.

Amended independent claims 1, 10, and 29 now recite translating a user data packet into a network data packet by replacing a *first* destination alias with a *second* destination alias that relates to a destination network address that relates to a selected one communication network. Alkhatib only discloses a first destination alias (domain name) translated to a destination network address (IP address), but not translated to a second destination alias. Translating the first destination alias into the second destination address advantageously improves load balancing across a network (Specification, page 74, line 27 to page 75, line 5). Thus, a user can invoke a network device, a macro, or a process by transmitting a first alias. Based on the user profile for the user, the access server can translate the first alias to a second alias. The second alias is known to the access server, but not known to the user via the user profile. If the second alias changes with respect to the communication network, the access server manages the impact of the change with respect the user profile.

Dependent claims 41, 43-46, 49-52, 53, and 55-58 each recite further limitations that render these claims separately patentable over the prior art. However, because the limitations of

base claims 1, 10, and 29 are sufficient to distinguish Shtivelman, the rejections based upon 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are traversed.

Dependent Claims 42, 48, and 54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alkhatib in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,282,574 (Voit). While claims 42, 48, and 54 each recite further limitations that render these separately patentable over the prior art, a discussion is not necessary because the limitations of base claims 1, 10, and 29 are sufficient to distinguish Alkhatib in view of Voit.

CONCLUSION

The claims in their present form are allowable over the art of record. Applicant therefore solicits their allowance. This Response is being filed within the Examiner's statutory period. Therefore, the Applicant believes no fees are due. However any additional fees may be charged to Deposit Account No. 21-0765.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 09-29-03



SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Stephen S. Roche, Reg. No. 52,176

Duft Setter Ollila & Bornsen LLC

Telephone: (303) 938-9999 ext. 15

Facsimile: (303) 938-9995

Correspondence address:

CUSTOMER NO. 28004

Attn: Harley R. Ball
6391 Sprint Parkway
Mailstop: KSOPHT0101-Z2100
Overland Park, KS 66251-2100